



Application No. : 10/664,256
Applicant : BASH et al.
Filed : September 17, 2003
Art Unit : 3744
Examiner : JONES, Melvin

Confirmation No. 3697

10 Docket No. : 100203431-1
Customer No. : 22879
Date: : February 1, 2006

15 Mail Stop: Amendment
Honorable Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE

20

Sir:

In response to the Office Action of October 4, 2005, ("the Office Action"), please consider the following remarks.

25

In the Office Action, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as unpatentable over the Patel et al. patent, U.S. Patent No. 6,484,521, in view of the Morris patent, U.S. Patent No. 5,393,348.

30

Applicants note with appreciation that objected-to claims 2-16 were acknowledged to be allowable over the references of record if rewritten in independent form, and that claims 17-49 were allowed.

35

The above-described objections and rejections are addressed as follows:

1. The Morris Patent Is Not Analogous Art

40

The Office Action recites the Morris patent as analogous art. The field of the applicants endeavor, in its broadest recitation, pertains to a cooling system for heat generating devices. The field of the Morris patent pertains to the apparatus for spray-